1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	MIDDLE DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA
3 4 5 6	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA) Case No. 1:12CR123-1) 1:12CR399-1 vs.) Greensboro, North Carolina KRISTEN DOUGLAS WELTER,) May 30, 2013
	Defendant.
7) 9:26 a.m.
8	
9	TRANSCRIPT OF SENTENCE
10	BEFORE THE HONORABLE WILLIAM L. OSTEEN, JR.
11	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
12 13	APPEARANCES:
14 15	For the Government: GRAHAM GREEN, AUSA Office of the U.S. Attorney 251 N. Main Street, Suite 726 Winston-Salem, North Carolina 27101
16	
17	For the Defendant: LISA S. COSTNER, ESQUIRE 200 Brookstown Ave., Ste. 304
18	WINSTON-SALEM, NC 27101 336-748-1885
19	
20	Court Reporter: Joseph B. Armstrong, RMR, FCRR
21	W. Market, Room 101 Greensboro, NC 27401
22	
23	
24	Proceedings reported by stenotype reporter.
25	Transcript produced by Computer-Aided Transcription.

US v. Welter - Sentence - May 30, 2013

1 PROCEEDINGS 2 (At 9:26 a.m., proceedings commenced.) 3 THE COURT: You may proceed. MR. GREEN: The first matter is United States 4 5 versus Kristen Douglas Welter. It's 1:12CR123-1 and 399-1. 6 It's on for sentencing. 7 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, sir. Ms. Costner, good morning. 8 9 MS. COSTNER: Good morning, Your Honor. 10 THE COURT: Are you and Mr. Welter ready to 11 proceed? 12 MS. COSTNER: Yes, Your Honor. 13 THE COURT: All right. Well, let me make one I think where we stand -- I raised an issue last 14 thing. 15 time about the one point, and Mr. Green wrote what I thought was a pretty persuasive brief on the subject and then 16 conceded that under the facts of this case they couldn't 17 18 prove the one point, I think is the way I understood it. So I assume there's no objection from the defendant on that 19 2.0 issue. 21 MS. COSTNER: No, Your Honor. 22 THE COURT: So who's here -- good morning, I will go ahead, based on my research in the 23 Ms. Meyers. Government's position, and remove the one point that was set 24 25 out in paragraph 53 of the presentence report and apply it

US v. Welter - Sentence - May 30, 2013

under Section 4A1.1(e). I do not -- I'll tell everybody, I do not anticipate running into this very often under the old Fair Sentencing Act, but it comes up pretty regularly under structured sentencing, it seems like, these days. So keep in mind the issues that can arise when there are offenses consolidated for judgment under the current state law.

Now, where does that leave us in terms of objections at this point, Ms. Costner?

2.0

MS. COSTNER: Your Honor, I did not file anything additional to what Mr. Chamberlin filed, but, you know, he made two factual objections which have no impact at all on Mr. Welter's guidelines, but they are two objections Mr. Welter does feel strongly about and would still want at least those put forth.

Mr. Chamberlin objected to the enhancement for obstruction of justice. I read his memorandum and wouldn't add anything to that in terms of any legal research.

And then Mr. Chamberlin opted not to address the acceptance of responsibility component in light of the projected motion to withdraw the plea to the child pornography charges. I understand the law as it stands as far as -- as that goes. I would just say to the Court on behalf of Mr. Welter that he did accept responsibility for the gun charge and would just want to point that out to the Court, but I understand the law as it applies in that case.

I believe those were all of the objections other than the one point for the criminal history, and I'm not intending to put on any evidence with respect to the factual objections except just to echo that, again, Mr. Welter does feel very strongly about these factual discrepancies.

2.0

THE COURT: All right. For some reason I remember it seems like one of them was -- I can't find it in the pleading. Let's see. Who disputed -- it seemed like there was objections one and two. I'm sorry, for some reason, Ms. Boggs [sic], I'm having trouble running down those factual objections.

MR. GREEN: There were two. One related to the question of whether when first interviewed by the FBI he denied -- he indicated he was Christian, and the second was related to when the agent came to his door on the gun purchase whether the agent asked him to go get the gun or he brought it out voluntarily.

THE COURT: All right. That flowed from the presentence report. That's right. That's what it was.

Okay. Objection Number One, defendant denies that he described his religious beliefs as Christian. I understand Muslim component, and, frankly, it doesn't make a difference to me in terms of sentencing or anything else, Muslim, Christian, what he may have told law enforcement officers at the time, so I will not consider that fact in

any way in imposing a sentence or -- in determining a sentence or calculating the guideline range.

Paragraph 8 the presentence report. I've forgotten what the circumstances were on --

MS. COSTNER: Your Honor, that was when the agent first interviewed him in March of 2012, and it's Mr. Welter's contention that the agent brought up the subject of the firearm, not Mr. Welter.

THE COURT: And I -- that's right. I don't really -- the PSR says Mr. Welter stated he wanted to purchase a semiautomatic .22 caliber handgun with a 9-inch barrel. I don't know whether Mr. Welter bought it up or the agent brought it up or where it came up, but I don't find that fact to be relevant to the calculation of the guideline range. Does he deny completely that he discussed with the agent the purchase of a 9-inch .22 caliber?

MS. COSTNER: No, Your Honor, not at all. It's just who initiated the conversation, and it was his contention that it was the agent not him. But certainly once the subject was brought up, he participated in a discussion about it.

THE COURT: All right. Well, I at this point in time don't find the person who may have initiated -- the fact that the agent or Mr. Welter initiated the discussion to be a fact upon which I will rely on in determining the

guidelines or in determining the -- an appropriate sentence in the case; and, furthermore, I'm not sure whether I -- that I read the report to specifically or implicitly suggest Mr. Welter initiated the discussion. I don't know how that discussion may have come up from what I read in the report.

2.0

That's not a commentary on either Mr. Welter or the FBI agent. I just don't read the report to clarify who may have initiated what in terms of that discussion, so I'll find those two don't need to be resolved because they have no impact on either the guidelines or the calculation of an advisory sentence.

Now, in terms of the objection to the obstruction of justice that has been imposed here, I don't understand there to be any objection to the facts, that is, that Mr. Welter contacted a neighbor and asked him to destroy two hard drives. Is that correct or incorrect?

MS. COSTNER: Well, the letter said, you know -in addition to many other things that he asked his neighbor
to do, he said if you find hard drives, throw them away. I
don't even believe he said destroy them. I think it was
just throw them away. You know, I would just point out to
the Court at that time the house had been searched,
computers had been seized. Mr. Welter had no idea whether
those hard drives had been seized or not, and so I would
just contend that his -- it was if you find them, throw them

```
away, not go seek them out and destroy them or, you know,
 1
 2
    erase them or anything of that nature. So it was in a list
    of water my plants, make sure the lights are turned off --
 3
              THE COURT: Your argument relates to
 4
    interpretation of the facts, not so much the facts that are
 5
    set out themselves.
 6
 7
                            Right. No question that that is not
              MS. COSTNER:
    mentioned in the letter about the hard drives.
 8
 9
              THE COURT: All right. And then I think the
10
    Government set forth an additional argument. I'm sorry.
                                                               Ι
11
    have a number of papers in Mr. Welter's case.
12
    Government contended in its response that Mr. Welter denied
13
    that he was, in fact, guilty of the child pornography
    offense to which he had previously pled guilty based on
14
15
    answers given during the psychosexual evaluation.
    Obviously, at this point in time Mr. Welter's testimony in
16
17
    terms of withdrawing his plea had not been offered to the
18
    Court. And then the Government also contends that the
    destruction of the two hard drives or the instructions to
19
20
    destroy the two hard drives constituted obstruction as well.
21
              Do you want to be heard on the second argument as
22
    well?
              MS. COSTNER: In terms of the denial of --
23
              THE COURT: Yes.
24
25
              MS. COSTNER: -- guilt to -- Your Honor heard the
```

on Mr. Welter's contention that he did not know that these files or these images were on his hard drive. He did not deny their existence, but just the knowledge. They were in temporary internet files. They had not been accessed since 2007, 2009, so for many years. This was a separate hard drive, not a part of an ongoing computer.

So his defense, had he been allowed to have a new trial, would have gone to knowledge and knowingly having these images on the hard drive. So I would contend that that's a little different than saying, well, I don't know how that hard drive got there, that must have been someone else's hard -- you know, clearly, they were in a file with his, you know, kristenwelter/internetexplorer/temporary files, and then the AVI was in the RealPlayer file also under his name. So it would have gone more to the knowledge element, and I'll contend that makes it a little bit different.

THE COURT: All right. Did you want to be heard further on the first part? I didn't mean to cut you off. I understand your argument on interpretation of what was meant by that note. Go ahead.

MS. COSTNER: I'm sorry. I didn't mean to interrupt, Your Honor. Mr. Chamberlin, I think, briefed it and set out the law and his contentions in his memorandum,

and I would just contend in light of that and the fact that the letter to the neighbor was not specific only as to the hard drives, it involved other activities, that really at the time Mr. Welter's house had been searched. It had been searched pursuant to a search warrant, and Mr. Welter at that point had been in custody since that time and really had no idea if, you know, hard drives had been seized or not seized or computers had been seized or not. It was more of an if you find, do this, not please go into this desk into this locked drawer and do this. It was not a specific. It was more of a conditional. If you see it, throw it away.

And so I would argue that that makes it a little bit different than directing somebody to go to a particular piece of evidence perhaps hidden in a place or something like that, especially in light of the fact that this house and the outbuildings and everything had been searched pursuant to this search warrant and searched very thoroughly, and, you know, he could have just as easily have assumed that the FBI had gotten all these items. He had no way to know since he was not present, he was in custody.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Green, I understand the two arguments. I assume the Government still urges both grounds in support of the obstruction --

MR. GREEN: We do.

THE COURT: -- enhancement. In terms of the

US v. Welter - Sentence - May 30, 2013

destruction of the computers, the application note says:

2.0

"This adjustment applies if the defendant's obstructive conduct occurred with respect to the investigation, prosecution, or sentencing of the defendant's instant offense of conviction; and, B, related to the offense of conviction and any relevant conduct or otherwise closely related case such as that of a codefendant.

Obstructive conduct that occurred prior to the start of the investigation of the instant offense of conviction may be covered by this guideline if the conduct was purposefully calculated and likely to thwart the investigation or prosecution of the offense of conviction."

There's a little bit of a component on destruction of the hard drives -- any hard drives you find in that we had the -- we'll call it the security investigation that started and culminated with the 922(g) offense, and then we had the second report from a neighbor who is asking to destroy the hard drives. That leads to this instant offense investigation. So I'm not sure how exactly to classify what he did.

In other words, if a defendant commits an offense and throws some of the evidence away before an investigation starts, then that doesn't constitute obstruction, I don't

think, under this guideline application; but if investigation has started, and he's destroying evidence to try to avoid detection of the offense, then you've got a different circumstance. Here it's kind of right on the line.

MR. GREEN: Right, and I think it's that second part of the guideline having to do with an offense -- the instant offense. When it refers to the instant offense, I mean, the child pornography offense.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. GREEN: I would liken it to if there was a fraud investigation, and they came through and collected a bunch of files in a fraud case, but a defendant also had whatever contraband, illegal narcotics, whatever it is, and said, hey, you know what, they may come back, we need to go ahead and destroy that as well, that's going to be obstructive conduct; and I think that's what the guideline calculates or anticipates.

THE COURT: Well, that's not -- the controlled substances aren't really related to the instant offense and the fraud.

MR. GREEN: Well, I understand, but I don't think that's what's required under the guidelines. I think the guidelines pretty clearly contemplate the first section being related to the offense of conviction and relevant

conduct or related offense; and then if it was purposefully calculated or likely to thwart the investigation of the offense of conviction. So I don't think there's -- in other words, I don't think the obstructive conduct when you have two offenses of conviction relates only to one and can only relate to one, if that makes sense.

THE COURT: That's what I'm struggling with.

Relevant conduct is all acts aided, abetted, counseled, and procured in preparation for the offense of conviction, during the commission of the offense of conviction, or in an effort to avoid detection for the offense of conviction in circumstances other than jointly undertaken conduct. So it's preparation for, commission of, and avoiding detection of. That's the definition of relevant conduct.

MR. GREEN: Yes, sir.

2.0

THE COURT: And your example, possession of a controlled substance, unless there's some relationship to the fraud, really isn't conduct that's committed in preparation for, during the commission of, or to avoid detection of for the offense of conviction. So I'm not sure I necessarily agree. I'm not saying I disagree, but I think it's a tougher argument to say controlled substances or child pornography in this case is relevant conduct to the offense of conv -- or the offense of investigation.

So it seems to me the obstructive conduct --

investigation, prosecution, or sentencing. None of that had 1 2 started with respect to the child pornography offense at the 3 time they were destroyed. MR. GREEN: Yes, sir. 4 So it's -- that's all going on with 5 THE COURT: 6 respect to security issues as well as a qun. 7 MR. GREEN: Yes, sir. THE COURT: So is it a closely related offense? 8 9 Is that what you contend? It is closely related, but if I'm 10 MR. GREEN: looking at the application note: 11 12 "Obstruction conduct that occurred prior to the start of the investigation of the instant offense" -- so if 13 the instant offense is child pornography, clearly, this 14 15 obstructive conduct occurred prior to that investigation of that -- "may be covered by this guideline if the criminal 16 conduct was purposefully calculated and likely to thwart 17 18 investigation of the prosecution of the offense of conviction." 19 2.0 So, you know, as I set out in -- as my paper, 21 there's no question Mr. Welter clearly knew that they were 22 interested in looking at his computer -- computers, and he 23 gave consent to do so. THE COURT: And they took them. 24 25 MR. GREEN: They took them, at least he thought

they did; and, of course, he got discovery in the case and would kind of be aware of what was seized and what was not seized. And so now we have -- now we have -- I'm sorry.

THE COURT: I don't read his letter as having occurred in relation to discovery. It was they took his computers, he goes to jail or detention, whatever, and then he wrote a letter while he's in jail saying --

MR. GREEN: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: -- go water my plants; and by the way, if you find any computer hard drives, throw those out, too.

MR. GREEN: That's right. And so the question, I think, for the Court is looking at Application Note One, is it obstructive conduct? I think, you know, whether it's, you know -- you know, feed the dog, and also get rid of my --

THE COURT: You would disagree with Ms. Costner's suggestion of the implication of the note.

MR. GREEN: Yes. I think it's quite clearly kind of in a kind of common sense approach, hey, there's some stuff I need you to take care of, one of which is throwing out these hard drives.

It clearly started prior to the start of the child pornography offense because they didn't know that there was child pornography existent at the time, and it was purposefully calculated to thwart the investigation of the

offense of conviction, which is the child pornography conviction. So I think if you -- if you kind of -- almost if you stripped away the gun charge, if you had the same contact -- contact with police, they come and seize your computers, and you subsequently say, hey, we need to go get rid of that hard drive before there's a charge, it is calculated to obstruct their investigation into that criminal offense.

So I think it's -- I don't even really think we need to be related conduct or relevant conduct because the Government will acknowledge it's a pretty big gap between the offense of conviction and, more specifically, what the Court is aware what they were looking for with regards to Mr. Welter and the ultimate discovery of the child pornography. But nevertheless, it is both the instant offense and the offense of conviction, that is, the child pornography, and it appears to me pretty clearly that the guideline would allow application of obstructive conduct for -- basically something that -- something you did before the investigation really gets rolling into what you are ultimately convicted of.

So I think if the Court finds that that was obstructive conduct, then pretty clearly it's going to apply. But I'm not going to argue that it's going to relate under those first prongs of a closely related case or

necessarily relevant conduct to the security investigation or the possession of firearm. Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: All right. Ms. Costner, I think the problem -- one of the problems that you have here for your client is we actually have two offenses of conviction, a 922(q) and this other. The investigation -- even if you carve out the child pornography, the investigation of the first offense -- or the investigation that led the pros -the prosecution of the first offense was very broad, that kind of security threat type investigation; and during the course of that investigation, I think by the time Mr. Welter wrote his letter, the Government has -- the investigators had indicated an interest in the material on his computers for a variety of reasons, arguably in some respects related to the gun charge in that -- has he communicated about guns? Is there any evidence that he's possessed other firearms in addition to the ones that we've seen.

I'm not sure that I find it compelling that computer hard drives were destroyed -- I mean were attempted to be destroyed during the course of that investigation, and the only offense that was later discovered was the child pornography offense. In other words, it seems to me there is a very broad investigation ongoing. The Government has -- the investigators have expressed an interest in examining the defendant's computers in relation to that

investigation; they've taken the ones they found; and then Mr. Welter tried to have a neighbor destroy the remaining computers. So I'm not sure there is necessarily much of a distinction between the original investigation and this particular case, even though the offenses charged ultimately ended up being separate offenses.

What's your response to that?

2.0

MS. COSTNER: What I would say to that, Your
Honor, is this is a situation where it wasn't just where
Mr. Welter turned over computers. There was a search
warrant executed on his residence, and there was a very
thorough search. I've seen the images. So, you know,
Mr. Welter knew that his home had been searched. He knew,
as you said, there was an interest in the hard drives and
other -- or any hard drives or any computer -- computers
that at the time he wrote the letter, he didn't know what
they had found and what they hadn't found. It was a
conditional letter "if you find." For all he knew, the hard
drives had been found and looked at and reviewed by law
enforcement and left there.

I mean, at this point he doesn't know what they're interested in, what they've looked at or haven't looked at, but they did have complete access to his home. So it wasn't a situation where they came to his door and said can we have your computers, and he handed them out the door to them, and

off they went. They took them into custody, and they went through everything; and when he's sitting in jail, he doesn't know what they've found and what they haven't.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

So in his mind easily they could have found the They could have reviewed them. hard drives. They could have found nothing on them of interest. You know, we know that there were things on them of interest, but you also heard that, you know, his defense to this would be he didn't know of the existence of those particular images. they are left in his home, it may be because the law enforcement has either looked at them or has no interest in them at that point in time. So any request to throw them away could be an innocent request in terms of not trying to destroy evidence of child pornography, but, you know, if it had adult pornography or if it had financial information to destroy it and get rid of it so that somebody coming into the house couldn't have access to it. That could be an explanation as well.

And I would ask the Court to consider that again in light of the fact that law enforcement had access to the entire house, and these hard drives were not in some safe that required a combination. They weren't in a secret, you know, hideaway place or under a floorboard or anything like that. I think they were in a drawer where anybody could have found them, and certainly they did a thorough job of

looking.

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

As you pointed out, this is a letter that he wrote with a list of things to do not in response to discovery. You know, just I would proffer that he did not receive a list of what had been seized from the house. That was contained in the discovery. But, you know, as Mr. Green well knows, we don't get to hand those things to our clients. We have to sit down and discuss with them what's in discovery, they can maybe take a look at them, but they can't keep what we receive from the Government in terms of I don't know whether Mr. Chamberlin had gone discovery. over it, whether he had received discovery at that point in time. But you don't see in the letter, well, the Government didn't get this, so go get it and throw it away. It's if you find it, throw it away, if it's there, so he didn't know.

THE COURT: Well, the letter was certainly alarming enough to cause his neighbor instead of doing what Mr. Welter asked, he turned the letter -- or whoever got the letter to turn it over to the FBI for their review. In my mind that at least is some suggestion of the way a third party interpreted what was included in the letter.

MS. COSTNER: Well, and I will say, too, Your Honor, one thing that Mr. Welter wanted me to point out at least at some point in time, and I'll say it now.

US v. Welter - Sentence - May 30, 2013

Subsequent to his arrest, there were news reports and -that made him out to be a terrorist basically. So, you
know, certainly it may be if she saw something about a hard
drive, she may have felt uncomfortable given the huge amount
of publicity that came along with Mr. Welter's arrest. It
may have had nothing to do with, you know -- I mean, I
understand what the Court's saying. That may have made her
uncomfortable in and of itself, not just the letter. I
mean, the letter is -- you know, I've got it here. It's a
little hard to read, but it doesn't -- it just says if you
find it, throw it away. Not go look for it, not seek it
out, not, you know, I have it in a hidden safe, here's the
combination, anything like that. It's just in a list of
things to do.

THE COURT: Doesn't that then take us back to the original issue, and that is that Mr. Welter attempted to destroy computer hard drives during the course of a terrorist/security investigation?

MS. COSTNER: But there's no evidence on those hard drives there was any information whatsoever that would factually tie him to some terrorist group or, you know, terroristic acts or terroristic knowledge. So his letter to this neighbor was just these are hard drives that I -- you know, I want you to get rid of, but not -- there's no evidence that he was getting rid of any of that information.

I'm just saying that may be what was in her mind at the time 1 2 as opposed to something about the letter that made her 3 uncomfortable. The publicity that was attached to his arrest may have made her uncomfortable. 4 5 THE COURT: All right. Do you want me to look at 6 the letter? I mean, it's described in here. I'm not asking 7 Everybody keeps referencing the letter. 8 MS. COSTNER: No, Your Honor, I --9 THE COURT: Mr. Green, do you have any objection? 10 MR. GREEN: No, sir. It's a little difficult to read, 11 MS. COSTNER: 12 I'll say that. It's not the best, unless Mr. Green has a 13 better copy. MR. GREEN: You go ahead, and I'll see if I can 14 15 find a better copy for you. I read that number three as "Look in 16 THE COURT: 17 my workroom, and see if you can find any computer hard 18 drives. If you find any, please throw them away." Is that correct? 19 20 MS. COSTNER: Yes, Your Honor. I would just point 21 out that law enforcement certainly had access to the 22 workroom along with everything else through that search 23 warrant. THE COURT: All right. Do you want me to mark 24 25 this, or just put it in the file?

US v. Welter - Sentence - May 30, 2013

MS. COSTNER: Your Honor, I can --

THE COURT: You can have it back.

2.0

All right. In Mr. Welter's case, I am going to find that the obstruction of justice enhancement is properly applied. We've talked about 3C1.1: If the defendant willfully obstructed or impeded or attempted to obstruct or impede the administration of justice with respect to the investigation, prosecution, or sentencing of the instant offense of conviction, and, two, the obstructive conduct related to the defendant's instant offense of conviction and any relevant conduct or, B, a closely related offense, increase the offense level by two levels.

I am aware that, as we've been discussing, the application note one, obstructive conduct that occurred prior to the start of the investigation of the instant offense of conviction may be covered by this guideline if the conduct was purposefully calculated and likely to thwart the investigation or prosecution of the offense of conviction.

Here, admittedly, it's -- there are unusual facts as set out in the presentence report. The investigation clearly started in terms of a -- we'll call it a security or potential threat to Homeland Security as detailed in paragraph 6 as set forth in the presentence report at paragraphs 9 and 10. Agents of the FBI searched the

defendant's residence; and in addition to seizing the revolver and ammunition, they also seized ammunition that apparently was something different from the actual gun found present, .410 shotgun shells, and then 92 rounds of various ammunition. That occurred on March the 22nd, 2012. As detailed in paragraph 11, during the search of his residence on that day, Mr. Welter provided consent to search all computers located in the residence, which apparently the FBI did.

2.0

However, on April 13, 2012, FBI was made aware of the existence of two hard drives that had been located in Mr. Welter's -- that were in Mr. Welter's residence but had not been found during the course of the original search. As we've been discussing, Mr. Welter had sent a letter to an individual asking that that individual locate the hard drives -- or check in a workroom, as I read, and if there are any hard drives to throw those hard drives away.

It seems to me at that time there is an investigation involving -- that's clearly known to Mr. Welter and is ongoing with respect to several different areas of conduct, areas at issue, including his possession of the firearms under the circumstances described in paragraphs 5 through 8 in the presentence report.

Mr. Welter's efforts to destroy evidence under those circumstances, even though that is unusual, I find is

properly classified as obstructive conduct in this case, that is, an effort to willfully impede.

2.0

I understand Ms. Costner's argument with respect to what might be construed as the benign nature of his comment about destroying hard drives, but I find the destruction of hard drives, one, to be very different from the other acts that Mr. Welter had asked his neighbor to perform on his behalf; that is, watering plants, emptying garbage, setting up phone accounts are all what would fall, at least in my opinion, in kind of a normal maintenance or routine maintenance type category. The destruction of the hard drives, it seems to me, falls into a very different category. My conclusion as to that conduct I find is further supported by the concern the neighbor obviously had in bringing the hard drives to the attention of the FBI.

Here, although the hard drives did not demonstrate or show any additional evidence related to the original investigation that had been undertaken, they ultimately did show the presence of child pornography which ultimately led to the second offense of conviction in this case.

Alternatively, I find that the obstruction of justice enhancement is properly applied in this case based upon Mr. Welter's testimony as given at the hearing in which he sought to withdraw his guilty plea, that is, after appearing in this court and representing to this Court under

oath that he was, in fact, guilty of an offense which had as an element the knowing possession of child pornography.

Mr. Welter later appeared and testified in this Court that he was -- or at least he did not believe that he was guilty of that offense based on the evidence that he had seen in the case after the entry of his plea.

2.0

I find in several respects Mr. Welter's testimony as contradicted by the evidence, that is, his original statements as well as Mr. Chamberlin's testimony with respect to the information he had provided Mr. Welter and the statements that Mr. Welter had made to him in relation to the child pornography offense, and therefore find alternatively that the obstruction of justice enhancement is properly applied in this case.

I think in some respects, particularly with respect to the original count, that is, possession of a firearm by a convicted felon, Mr. Welter's candid statements with the Court and his entry of a guilty plea might otherwise support an application of the acceptance of responsibility adjustment. However, in looking at the totality of the circumstances, that is, Mr. Welter's conduct with respect to both offenses in this case, I find that the acceptance of responsibility, Section 3E1.1, should not be applied.

However, I do find that as a result of that at

```
least Mr. Welter's partial acceptance in relation to the
1
2
    922(g) offense has not been fully accounted for, and I will
3
    consider that factor in terms of a variance or a possible
    variance in this particular case.
4
              Does that resolve the pending objections at this
 5
6
    point?
7
              MS. COSTNER:
                            Yes, Your Honor.
8
              THE COURT: All right. Then, Mr. Welter, I'll ask
9
    you at this point in time, have you reviewed the presentence
10
    report with Ms. Costner?
                              Yes, sir, I have.
11
              THE DEFENDANT:
12
              THE COURT: And other than the factors that
13
    Ms. Costner has brought to my attention, are there any
    additional objections?
14
15
              THE DEFENDANT:
                              Could you repeat that, sir?
16
              THE COURT:
                          That was a bad question.
              THE DEFENDANT: Well, I have to read your lips as
17
18
    well to hear what you're saying.
              THE COURT: Are there any other objections other
19
    than what Ms. Costner has brought to my attention?
20
21
                             No, there -- no, Your Honor.
              THE DEFENDANT:
              THE COURT: All right. You may have a seat.
22
                                                             Then
    I will overrule the objections. I adopt the presentence
23
    investigation report without change. In Mr. Welter's case,
24
25
    the resulting -- neither offense of conviction carries a
```

US v. Welter - Sentence - May 30, 2013

```
mandatory minimum sentence. The resulting advisory
 1
 2
    guideline calculation is as follows:
 3
              A total offense level of 30.
              A criminal history category of three.
 4
 5
              A guideline imprisonment range of 121 to 151
 6
    months. Yes, sir?
 7
              MR. GREEN: I think his criminal history category
    history is two given the --
 8
 9
              THE COURT: Oh, that's right, I forgot.
10
    sorry, Ms. Meyers, let me come back to you. With a thirty
    and a two, where does that leave us?
11
12
              MS. MEYERS: Your Honor, with a thirty and a two,
    that's 108 to 135. The fine range does not change.
13
              THE COURT: All right.
14
15
              A supervised release range of one to three years
    as to the 12C123 case and five years to life as to the
16
    12CR399 case.
17
18
              The fine range does not change. It remains at
    15,000 to $150,000.
19
2.0
              And a special assessment of $100 as to each count
21
    is mandatory.
22
              Give me just a second, Ms. Costner. All right.
23
    Ms. Costner, will there be any additional evidence on behalf
    of Mr. Welter?
24
25
              MS. COSTNER: No, Your Honor, no evidence.
```

THE COURT: All right. Then I'll hear from you at this time as to what constitutes a sentence that is sufficient but not greater than necessary taking into consideration the advisory guideline calculation as well as all other factors set forth under 18 USC Section 3553.

2.0

MS. COSTNER: Thank you, Your Honor. Your Honor, I know the Court has reviewed the presentence report and Mr. Chamberlin's memorandum, and I just want to add a few things to that for the Court to consider.

Your Honor, in looking at, first of all, the history and characteristics of Mr. Welter, I know the Court is aware of his criminal history and that it's not insignificant in terms of the actions that caused him to serve a prison sentence about -- of about 25 years, although he did not serve all of that.

Prior to that time, though, Your Honor, he had served in the military. He had served in the Marines. He had had some injuries. In talking to Mr. Welter, he feels like even during that period of time, he may have been suffering from some post traumatic stress syndrome and some other mental health issues. Your Honor, I think that is supported by what you see in the presentence report and in the psychological evaluation.

Mr. Welter had a very difficult childhood. He had parents who were not very engaged in child-rearing and, in

fact, were abusive. His sister verified that. I think the fact that there is no family here today is very telling of that family history. He's not close to his brothers or sisters. They all apparently have disclosed a pretty traumatic upbringing, and it sounds like Mr. Welter really felt the brunt of that and that has followed him throughout his life and has caused some of the mental health issues that I think are before the Court -- or that, you know, in him as he sits before the Court.

Having said that, though, Your Honor, there are some good things about Mr. Welter, and one of those is his work history. For somebody that had the type of prior convictions, criminal history that he has, he has -- I think he described himself as God's gift to the mechanical world, and I think that's supported in his work history. Your Honor, he's worked at various auto mechanic shops and tire shops. He's earned a good income. He's apparently been an excellent employee, and he's been a hard worker. He had a home -- has a home that he's in danger of losing at this point, but it was a home that he was living in at the time of his arrest.

Really, since his discharge from prison, he -other than one, I think, prior charge that was dismissed, he
really hadn't -- there was no other problems with the law.
He -- in fact, from talking to him, and I think this is

borne out in the investigation materials in the presentence report, prior -- right -- the firearm that was found in the home was taken from a neighbor who had threatened to kill herself. He tells me he kept it in an outbuilding.

2.0

But then he had a total knee replacement just a few weeks before his arrest. He was engaged in some internet websites involving Muslims. He is Muslim, and he's freely admitted that. He had received some threats from some other folks and was scared, found himself in a pretty disabled position because he had his knee surgery, and they released him home, no family, no one really to care for him. He did have neighbors sort of checking on him, but, you know, a knee replacement is a pretty debilitating type of surgery, and it renders one pretty helpless.

THE COURT: Now, I understand the point on taking the gun from the neighbor who is concerned about whether she will use the gun to kill her self, but isn't that story undermined by the presence of other types of ammunition in the house, .410 and 92 rounds of assorted ammunition?

MS. COSTNER: There's no other weapon in the house, Your Honor; and, you know, certainly at the time that he was charged with this, the only weapon was the one that was seized --

THE COURT: I understand that, but doesn't the presence of various types of ammunition plus an express

interest, regardless of who instigated it, in purchasing other firearms suggest this is not a one-time, isolated instance?

MS. COSTNER: May I have a moment?

THE COURT: You may.

2.0

(Discussion between counsel and defendant.)

MS. COSTNER: And I'm sorry, Your Honor, that's not a point I ever talked to Mr. Welter about. What he tells me is that all came from the neighbor. She gave him a bag that had the firearm and all her ammunition, and that's what she had in the house.

Now, did he engage in conversation with this agent or undercover person about firearms? Yes, he did. And I did talk to him about that, and basically what he tells me is that was just a conversation about guns, ammunition. It wasn't, you know, any plot or any disclosure on his part of some desire to have a cache of guns or to, you know, start some kind of terrorism or some kind of problem. He was just talking to another person about firearms and guns and was not intending that to be some conversation to reflect some desire on his part to accumulate a stash of them.

And he didn't have a stash of them, he had this weapon, and he had it nearby after his surgery because he was scared and wanted just to have something to defend himself with it. Was that a good decision? You know,

obviously not. You know --

2.0

THE COURT: I can't figure Mr. Welter out. I mean, Mr. Welter in some respects is kind of just like an individual who likes to stir the pot and create trouble. I mean, that -- just do these little things to irritate and get under the skin of other people.

On the other hand, Mr. Welter, it seems to me, never is forthcoming about what he's done. He tries to downplay attempting to blow up a law enforcement officer as being kind of first cousin to a prank but an offense for which he received a sentence of 25 years and served 9.

He then, while he is in custody on that offense, rewires a vehicle to shock the individual who attempts to start the vehicle; and when a guard attempts to start the vehicle and is shocked, he's sanctioned for that, and he attempts to downplay that by, well, we were just playing pranks on each other, and I didn't know the guard would get in the car.

He then changes his religion to Islam, travels to Lebanon; and when the FBI shows up, he starts showing them how adept he is with this .22 pistol that he's got, describes to them how he would like to purchase other firearms, and then comes into court and says I was just holding all this as a good deed for my neighbor who had threatened to commit suicide.

I asked my neighbor to destroy hard drives during the course of an FBI investigation, but that was just routine maintenance, and I didn't mean anything by that.

So maybe it is true that some of things Mr. Welter does are not the most serious, but Mr. Welter's pattern of conduct of trying to excuse and minimize that conduct is really what troubles me about him. Standing alone, the 922(g) offense was a 10- to 16-month. Standing alone, the possession of child pornography is not nearly the most serious of the possession of child pornography offenses, and I can assure you I -- and I will do it today -- I think the computer overstates the seriousness of the offense, and some of these adjustments, in my opinion, need to be reduced.

But every time something comes up, Mr. Welter's got an answer that most of the time really doesn't make -- ring true, I guess, is the better way to put it. So he manages to escalate, in my mind, what he's done with what he does after he does it.

MS. COSTNER: Certainly, he makes some very poor choices, and that's probably an understatement in many ways.

But, Your Honor, I know, has reviewed his psychological evaluation, and I think some of the minimization is part of his psychological profile. And I would either venture to say that when one has been the victim of physical and emotional abuse in your home as a

child growing up, that tends to make one minimize, and I'm just saying that from experience of dealing with people in that situation. It's hard to accept responsibility, I think, when as a young child you've been beaten and terrorized and abused by your own parents.

2.0

And so I would contend that his history and his -the psychological testing support some of that -- or what
the Court is saying in terms of your evaluation of his
behavior, but I'm not convinced that it's willful in all
respects, and I think that's based on his history and the
testing, Your Honor.

And, you know, it is a series of poor choices, but I would say that this is also a man who can function. He is a loner. He lives alone. Clearly, he has no family. Here, but he's worked --

THE COURT: He's got some skills.

MS. COSTNER: He's got great skills.

THE COURT: He's obviously very bright.

MS. COSTNER: Great job history. He's got a high IQ. His IQ testing was high. You know, he described to me, and I saw this in the discovery, times when working at Pep Boys -- he observed somebody driving under the influence and he called, and they were arrested. So he apparently reported the Muslim -- or the Islamic person who was threatening him, and he was afraid of that person and made a

US v. Welter - Sentence - May 30, 2013

report about it. So he has been proactive in those aspects, but then he sort of in some ways walks this line that the Court described.

2.0

But where that puts him -- and, you know, that's the nature and characteristics of Mr. Welter. There's good and there's bad as there are in most people. There just maybe seems to be more extremes.

But I think that, you know, what the discovery and the investigation did bear out is that, you know, while this man did have this weapon in his home, and while on this computer there was this very old child pornography -- and, you know, I haven't gotten to the -- you know, just talking about actually the offenses themselves. I've discussed the weapons charge with the Court, but this child pornography was on a hard drive not attached to a computer.

Looking at, at least, you know, the analysis, and I'm not a computer expert, but I do have this -- you know, all of it -- the images, it looked like, were in temporary internet files. Then you have this video that was in this AVI file in a different place, not in a temporary file. But it looked to me like some of it may have been accessed maybe in 2009. That may be when he downloaded the hard drive on to that hard drive with a new computer. Maybe it was accessed in 2007, maybe 2002, but it was very old.

And even, you know, from the agent that testified,

he could only find that the video in his analysis had been looked at one time. That's all he saw support for. And I'm not saying that he testified it had only been looked at once, but he couldn't find any -- or accessed, I guess. The accessing and looking at it may be two different things. You could see it and turn it off and not delete it.

2.0

But this is a case where this man had on this hard drive where -- was it 140 images, and 75 of them were attributed to one video. So certainly very few images. Very little access, if at all. Very old and in temporary files. Those images were not loaded into My Pictures or some kind of file like that. They were temporary internet files that somebody had to go and actually find on a hard drive. They weren't saved in a little folder or anything like that where you, you know, you might keep your pictures that you want to look at all the time.

There was no file sharing software. No evidence that these photos were traded or, you know -- if anything, they may have been -- you know, they were downloaded off of Internet Explorer and in a temporary file, and so I think that takes it sort of out of the realm of maybe what we normally see in these kinds of cases where, you know, people do keep these images or they're sharing them or there's file sharing software.

THE COURT: One of my concerns, and I don't think

it's a necessarily a fair consideration, though, is that
Mr. Welter -- he had two hard drives standing -- apparently
standing alone in his house. Now, I don't know,
Ms. Costner, what you do with your computers, but usually I
have to rely on some kind of expert to come in and wipe a
hard drive, and I just get rid of the computers.

2.0

There's a level of sophistication here that gives me some concern like in the gun case where we've got evidence of possession of gun and multiple types of ammunition and suggestions about interest in buying guns after the offense is committed that there's more here than meets the eye, so to speak. You may disagree. I'm kind of asking the question, but --

MS. COSTNER: Well, I would disagree with that because I met with these -- the FBI agents that analyzed the hard drives and the external hard drives and the computers, and, I mean, it seems to me that they -- I mean, they could find no evidence, and, you know, my under -- I'm no expert in computers. I have some working knowledge, but I'm not, you know, by any means con -- would consider myself an expert, but I do enough to know that to -- I remember going to a seminar with Tom Cochran who basically spoke and said you have to shoot one six times to really get rid of all the images and everything on a hard drive. I mean, it stays resident. So I think if they couldn't find anything on

those hard drives other than what is before the Court, it just wasn't there.

2.0

THE COURT: I have to say -- I'll hear from Mr. Green, but I think that's a relatively fair point. I mean, Mr. Welter's done some rather -- clever may not be quite the right word in terms of hiding his conduct, but I think it would be unfair to Mr. Welter to speculate about what else might be out there in light of your argument.

MS. COSTNER: I do. I think that they analyzed it, I'm sure, very, very thoroughly, and I have no doubt that, you know -- given the fact that, you know, when he was arrested -- I looked at the archived, you know, video from the news organizations. They thought apparently that they had some terrorist who, you know, was plotting to overthrow the Government almost, and certainly none of that was on the hard drive either, and I'm sure they had every incentive to comb through those computers with the finest of fine tooth combs at that point.

Having said that, Your Honor, that sort of transitions me into talking about the seriousness of the offense and the punishment and that sort of -- that part of 3553, and Mr. Welter did want me to let the Court know that those news interviews have been very detrimental to him. He's been punished in some ways. And I'm not saying that the Court should substitute this for any punishment, but

just to let the Court know.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Mr. Welter lost almost every friend he had had based on those interviews. He -- you know, people distanced themselves from him. He feels that even when he serves whatever sentence the Court gives out, anybody that Googles him or goes online to search and sees those interviews may believe that he, in fact, is a terrorist, and he may never get employment again, and he has suffered from that and feels terrible about it, and it is of great concern to him.

Your Honor, the guideline range for Mr. Welter is very high, and I know that part of the five-point swing is the obstruction and acceptance of responsibility. But even without that, we're talking about a very large sentence for what I would contend -- and I'm really talking more about the child pornography charges because I know what the guidelines are with the gun charge -- for images that are old, three years at the minimum, probably older than that based on what I see; images that are in temporary files, not accessed; images that were not part of file sharing software; images on a hard drive not even hooked up to a computer; and no evidence that on any of the computers that he was currently using that these -- that he had any type of this type of material on that computer. So I would ask the Court to take all of that into consideration in fashioning a sentence.

US v. Welter - Sentence - May 30, 2013

And, you know, Mr. Chamberlin did set out sort of a proposed range of 41 to 51 months in his position paper. I would contend to the Court that that in light of all the 3553 factors is a reasonable sentence, and I would ask the Court to consider a sentence at that range.

2.0

And let me just make sure. Oh, and just to let you know a couple other things about Mr. Welter that I wanted to point out. He is -- he does have some medical considerations. He's had this total knee replacement. He's having some issues with that. He came here today on a cane. He does suffer from migraines and some other health, spine, head injuries.

In sentencing him, Your Honor, we would ask the Court to, first of all, recommend a designation to a place for mental health treatment. I think Mr. Welter would like to get some assistance with some of the post traumatic stress and the other issues that may have been raised in the psychological evaluation.

I would also point out in -- and I meant to say this in the psychosexual evaluation, Dr. Hirsch in evaluating Mr. Welter found that he is, I believe, a low risk -- oh, he may have been low to moderate.

THE COURT: Low moderate, I think.

MS. COSTNER: No evidence -- but I would contend that's more based on the materials than, you know, the

testing with Mr. Welter. No evidence that Mr. Welter is attracted to children, is a danger to children, is someone that is aroused by these types of images. You know, as I said, a high IQ and some other psychological issues, but no evidence that Mr. Welter has some type of pedophilic sort of, you know, inclinations at all. But Mr. Welter would be interested in psychological assistance just to deal with some of the issues that have followed him throughout his life from his childhood.

Also if the Court could recommend a medical facility to help him further with the knee issue, and he does have some back and head problems and would be very interested in any medical care that he could avail himself while in the Bureau of Prisons.

THE COURT: All right.

2.0

MS. COSTNER: Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Green?

MR. GREEN: Well, Your Honor, I guess we've got, you know, two issues, two offenses. One is the firearm offense. I think that necessarily implies looking at what kind of felon was he? You know, we've kind of stripped away with Simmons and a bunch of other stuff. I guess we got rid of a bunch of nonserious felonies, you know, or at least that's one way of looking at it.

But what he was convicted of was extremely

serious. He attempted to murder a law enforcement officer.

I know the Court talked some about his -- you know, kind of his approach to it, that it was a prank. In one sense he does seem to be talking out of that side of his mouth.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But when he gets in with Dr. Hirsch in the psychosexual evaluation and they discuss the criminal history, it's ten times worse than that. He blames the trooper, right? The trooper was harassing him. The trooper had caused his divorce -- his wife to come home and want a divorce because she had been stopped outside. He says, alternatively, that he lashed out at the trooper -- this is on page 5 at the bottom. He admits that his intention was to kill him, to murder a North Carolina State Highway patrolman. And then kind of the penultimate line, page 6 at the top of that page, in the doctor's opinion he seemed ambivalent when asked if he felt bad about what the officer That is, of course, getting in your car and experienced. having pipe bombs go off and nearly kill you, and his answer was that the officer got a serious wake-up call.

Now, we talk about history and characteristics of people, but, I mean, you have an individual who uses a sophisticated, premeditated planned way of killing someone, and his opinion is, well, he got a wake-up call, and that doesn't seem to have been -- that kind of approach to life doesn't seem to have been assuaged by any life experience or

whatever because we get in the situation, and it's well, you know, I had the gun, but that was really to protect my neighbor, but I had it for seven years. I had it readily available when the person comes to the door and could show them and demonstrate. I have other ammunition of different types in the house, but that's really -- it really doesn't -- you know, that relates more to my neighbor and her problem. That's his approach. Oh, I want to discuss about this other gun that I may purchase, but really this is more about my neighbor.

2.0

He obstructs justice, as the Court has so found, both as to the ongoing investigation and the seriousness of that ongoing investigation, and he attempts to -- really, it's worse because he attempts to elicit someone unknowingly in his plot to get rid of evidence that he knows is wrong. He says -- we have a whole series where I didn't plead guilty. I don't know anything about this stuff. Judge, you really ought not to consider me and -- because I really didn't know about that stuff; and were I to go to trial, that would be an argument, even though he admitted that he did, in fact, know it before Judge Schroeder and essentially admitted it before you again.

When we look at his psychological history as it relates to the child pornography, he's adjudged a low to moderate risk based on what? Self-reporting about what his

```
own attraction to children when he denies that he did that
 1
 2
    now, and he denies it to Dr. Hirsch. That's kind of --
    that's kind of -- that's not a surprise result one would
 3
    think. Hey, he denies the typical history and
 4
    characteristics associated with pedophiles --
 5
 6
              THE COURT:
                         What would you point to as evidence
 7
    that he constitutes a higher risk than that based on what's
    present in this case in terms of pedophilia?
 8
 9
              MR. GREEN:
                          Well, I think he's a high risk to be
    an offender, period, a violent offender. I consider --
10
              THE COURT: But my question relates to pedophilia
11
12
    because you disagree with Dr. -- or you express concern
13
    about Dr. Hirsch's opinion --
              MR. GREEN: Yes, sir.
14
15
              THE COURT:
                         -- of a low to moderate risk in that
16
    category.
17
              MR. GREEN:
                          To the extent that that opinion is
18
    based on Mr. -- Defendant Welter's self-reporting about
    anything at all, then, yes --
19
20
              THE COURT: It's based on self-reporting, testing,
21
    and Dr. Hirsch's opinion on that constellation of factors.
22
              MR. GREEN:
                           I understand that. The testing itself
    is self-reporting. I mean, I don't want to belittle
23
    Dr. Hirsch or belittle psychology or psychiatry in general,
24
25
    but we don't have a test yet that's objective that says we
```

```
can hook you up, and that's going to tell us you're going to
1
2
    be a pedophile in the future.
3
              THE COURT: You are challenging his findings.
              MR. GREEN:
                          I am.
 4
              THE COURT: All right. So what evidence is there
5
6
    in this case that would suggest he is a higher than low to
7
    moderate risk in terms of pedophilia?
8
                          Well, I think you're misunderstanding
              MR. GREEN:
9
    my point.
               If we have an assessment based on certain
10
    factors, which include his self-reporting, in which during
    that self-reporting he, in fact, denies committing the
11
12
    offense in question --
13
              THE COURT: Which is something Dr. Hirsch knew
    too, didn't he?
14
15
              MR. GREEN:
                          He did, no question. But I think you
    can certainly look at that in a little more skeptical eye as
16
17
    opposed to a defendant who came in and said yes, because of
18
    some prior abuse, I've had a fleeting interest in child
19
    pornography, and that is the circumstances of what happened
2.0
    here.
21
              THE COURT:
                          So disregard that testing entirely?
    Where does that leave you?
22
23
              MR. GREEN: Well, I don't know if you disregard it
    entirely, but, again, my understanding of these
24
25
    circumstances as it's described in the thing is the testing
```

is comprised in many respects of self-reporting of a constellation of symptoms or I like children, I don't like children. We look at prior events in his past. Did he abuse, you know, animals and so forth.

2.0

So as part of that criteria, that is, I am going to honestly give you information about the way I feel about things, he's denied it. I mean, denied it completely. And Dr. Hirsch himself says, hey, look, in the future, on page -- well, in the PSR notes, hey, part of his criteria for being successful and this -- because he's a low to moderate risk, and what I'm suggesting is appropriate, he's got to admit his conduct. That's noted on in the PSR as well.

I mean, where are we going to -- what's our hope there that he's denied it at every turn now? What's our hope that this gentleman is going to say you know what? I do have a problem as it relates to child pornography. If we look at the circumstances in which -- and I understand Ms. Costner's example, and maybe part of this is just I kind of in one respect look at this maybe like somebody -- a member of the public would. I don't do these cases all the time. You know, the Court, I know, has many, many, many more child pornography cases, and I know just by anecdotal evidence that there's probably people who have thousands of images.

THE COURT: There are, which is the reason I asked my question. I mean, even if I kick out Dr. Hirsch's report and say it's unreliable because Mr. Welter doesn't tell the truth, we're talking about 145 images here that at least on the evidence before the Court I don't know that anything was downloaded or looked at prior to -- after 2009, and I'm not sure about the time frame. So I'm not sure what the basic evidence is in the case to suggest that Mr. Welter is a high risk or something more than low to moderate, at least by comparison to other cases.

MR. GREEN: Well, I guess it's higher risk of what? That's one question.

THE COURT: I understand that. But you are the one that started talking about pedophilia, and that's the part -- I understand the risk of future criminal conduct.

MR. GREEN: Yes, sir.

2.0

THE COURT: But it was your point related to pedophilia, and that's the one I don't understand because even without Dr. Hirsch's opinion, without Mr. Welter's statements, take all that out, assume he's not telling the truth, it's not the most egregious of these offenses that I have seen, which is where I'm struggling to say he's a high risk on that particular offense.

MR. GREEN: I understand. I don't -- and I think -- I don't want to misstate -- what I'm saying here is

US v. Welter - Sentence - May 30, 2013

I don't come into court and say I can predict the future. I quite honestly believe as relates to his danger to children to sexually abuse them -- I don't know. I don't think Dr. Hirsch is particularly helpful with -- his assessment particularly aids the circumstances when you have a defendant in this case who is denying the very conduct which he is self-reporting on.

So, yeah, I think we should take it off, and the point I was trying to make is, again, not being as experienced as the Court, I mean, I don't know how many pictures of an 8-year-old or a 7-year-old or a 12-year-old engaged in some sexual act where an adult male ejaculates into her mouth, I mean, how many do we have to have? I certainly understand that there's some people who come into court with 35,000 of them.

THE COURT: I mean -- exactly.

MR. GREEN: Right.

2.0

THE COURT: There's -- so the point is sometimes the only yardstick I have is by comparison to other cases, and this one in terms of that particular conduct is not even close to a number of cases, and I don't know what to conclude from that. I understand your point about Dr. Hirsch, but he's got some expertise. I've seen his reports before. Low to moderate is pretty common on a simple possession only offense, almost regardless of what

the defendant says.

I don't see any evidence here of an approach of a live human being, of any unusual associated conduct, and so I'm not sure how to find anything other than a low to moderate risk, frankly.

MR. GREEN: Of pedophilia.

THE COURT: Um-hum.

MR. GREEN: But not necessarily law breaking.

THE COURT: No, the other conduct is a different

story.

2.0

MR. GREEN: Right. And I guess also, Your Honor, I can't predict if he's going to get on a computer again. Obviously, part of your judgment is going to be that he does not. But I think sometimes -- again, I am removed from doing these cases everyday, but the offense itself is the offense itself. I mean, you have victim impact statements as part of the PSR. I mean, being re-victimized every time someone is in their trailer in Concord and views again your father sexually abusing you, I think sometimes we all lose sense of that, that these continual downloading creates a market for these individuals. Why does that stuff continue to appear on the internet? Because there's an appetite for it, and therefore it creates basically an incentive for people to abuse children.

So, again, I don't do these cases all the time, so

maybe my -- "outrage" is not the right word, just extreme discomfort with the topic.

THE COURT: I mean, if you're not outraged by the material, then you're not human.

MR. GREEN: Right.

2.0

THE COURT: That's part of the problem. But I have some other responsibilities both with respect to the victims and the general public as far as Mr. Welter's future conduct.

MR. GREEN: Fair enough.

I think his future conduct -- again, we have an individual convicted of in the past extremely serious crime. He minimizes it. He blames others. He again violates the law by possessing a firearm, which is, I think, more serious in his case because of the nature of his prior conduct. He minimizes it. Says it's someone else's fault. It's because my knee was hurt. Then he engages in obstructive conduct and denies any responsibility for the more serious of the offenses.

In toto, Your Honor, I think looking at the 3553 factors, a guideline sentence is appropriate.

Mr. Chamberlin when he made that prediction was assuming

that none of the enhancements were going to apply, and I think a guideline sentence is appropriate given this particular defendant and his nature and characteristics.

THE COURT: All right. I am going to hear from Mr. Welter, and then we're going to take a short break, and I'll come back and give you my ruling in the case.

2.0

And while we're on break, Mr. Green,
Mr. Ramaswamy, I mentioned this earlier, and Mr. Ramaswamy
is familiar with it. I do, in today's technological age,
have concerns about plus two on the computer because that's
about all we see in 100 percent of the offenses. Here, the
number of images is not significant. The types of images
given the history of some of this viewing of child
pornography materials, while alarming, in isolation in terms
of comparison to other defendants, I think it's very serious
in this case. The plus four sometimes causes me some
issues. So Mr. Ramaswamy can give you some background if
you want to be heard further on that. When I come back,
I'll be happy to hear from you briefly.

Mr. Welter, you're not required to say anything.

If you choose to remain silent, your silence will not be held against you in any way whatsoever, but you do have the right to address the Court before any sentence is imposed; and if you wish to address the Court, now is the appropriate time.

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you very much, Your Honor.

First off, Your Honor, I find I must address my

crime from 1986 first because this is the basis for

```
everything that has happened from that point on in my life.
 1
 2
                          Must address your first?
              THE COURT:
 3
              THE DEFENDANT:
                             My crime in 1986.
                          Oh, the crime in 1986.
              THE COURT:
 4
                              Yes, sir, must address it.
 5
              THE DEFENDANT:
 6
    is the opinion I'm given that I think this is a flippant,
 7
    flyby -- you know, just this little joke, and I don't take
 8
    it as a joke. Every time I try to have a relationship with
 9
    someone, I have to tell them of this crime. Every time I
10
    apply for a job, I have to tell them about this crime.
    Everything that goes on in my life, I have to tell them
11
12
    about that. It affects my life in ways today that I cannot
    communicate. It is an extreme load on me, and I have
13
    extreme guilt about it, so I don't tell people about it.
14
15
    am very ashamed of it, and I cannot reiterate that enough to
    this Court.
16
17
              At the time for whatever reasons I've justified it
18
    to myself, I felt I was justified. I was wrong.
                                                       I have
19
    admitted that, I have lived with that, I have dealt with
2.0
    that, and I do not want this Court or the prosecutor to make
21
    light of my own personal feelings about this.
                                                    I have to --
22
              THE COURT: Nobody's making light of your
    feelings, Mr. Welter, but did you go in and tell Dr. Hirsch
23
24
    there wasn't that much to it.
25
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor, I did, and it is
```

a tendency when you do these things to try to blow them off, to minimize them, because to communicate that I tried to do something to someone for the reasons I did it, it doesn't wash with me, okay. I'm lying to myself if I try to say I was legitimate. I wasn't legitimate, and I know that.

So when people say, well, what about this, you try to blow it off because you say -- you just don't like facing it, and I have to face it constantly. Some people, you know, in prison pat you on the back and say you're a hero. I am not a hero. I don't want anybody ever saying that about me. I mean, I tell them that. I am not proud of that. People try to say -- oh, they come up and ask about explosives, they ask about how you do this, that, and I say, dude, I don't even want to get into that because that is a no-win proposition.

THE COURT: I understand your point on that,

Mr. Welter. Anything directly related to these offenses you
would like to say?

THE DEFENDANT: Okay. The proposition has been made that for some reason -- or basically that the firearm I had in my possession was because of certain factors, and I just want to go over this very quickly. My neighbor brought the weapon to me. I took it from her because I felt she would commit suicide. But I, the next day, took and put it in her shed so she would possess it because I knew I should

not have the this weapon. I did not want this weapon. She brought a bunch of ammunition and things like that. I took the entire thing and said here, take this back, put it in your shed, this is your possession, I don't want it. That was like eight or nine years ago. It stayed there. I never had any fascination with it at all.

2.0

The only reason I brought it into my house was because I had already contacted law enforcement -- and this may sound like a copout, but I had -- concerning threats -- international threats. I had contacted the FBI and written them a letter saying this man is threatening me, here is what he has said, he's tried to hire a hit man, I think, because that was in the text, and I feared from my life. I never heard back from the FBI. That was in November of 2011.

When I had my knee operated on, I'm basically debilitated. I'm double and triple dosing Vicodin, Percocet, whatever, for the pain, and I for whatever reason felt my life was not safe. There's an old saying "You dial 9-1-1, all it does is tell them where the body is." I felt I had to protect myself. I got the gun. I had it in my house merely to protect myself. That was the only thing I wanted to do.

THE COURT: So what was there about the undercover FBI agent you felt you needed to protect yourself from?

THE DEFENDANT: He had -- okay. Here is a man who comes on my rear deck. He is obviously lying to me about why he is there. I don't know who this person is, but I get a vibration from him he's lying to me about something. He's telling me he was moving to the area. He had X amount of dollars in exact amount. He was looking to buy a trailer that wasn't even for sale. He's very clean cut. He's very educated, but he says he works in construction. Nothing about this agent jibed. He was throwing out alarm bells. I almost called 9-1-1.

2.0

But instead, he starts -- he says "I noticed a Marine Corps sticker on the back of your van. Were you in the Marines?" I said "Yes, I was in the Marines." He said "Well, do you like to shoot? I'm looking for a shooting range," and the conversation went on to firearms. I'm thinking to myself this man is either 100 percent here, you know, just talking about this, or he's trying to find out if I'm armed and if I'll protect myself. At that juncture I figure I'll just show him I've got a gun, and that is the problem. I went and got the gun and said, "See, I've got a gun, here's how it works," etc., etc. Then he leaves and says "I'll see you later. Hopefully, I'll be your neighbor." I put the gun back in my home not knowing this is an undercover agent.

But this wasn't the first time the FBI had been in

my home. The first time the FBI came to my home was in May of 2011 when they interviewed me about my trip to Lebanon.

2.0

THE COURT: All right. Now, a lot of these facts

I'm aware of, Mr. Welter, so if there's a point here --

THE DEFENDANT: There seemed to be some confusion about when each of these things happened. The FBI first came to my home, and then the undercover agent came 10 months later. It was two totally separate events.

This is why I was talking about he said he wanted to talk about guns, target shooting, things like that. When I was in the Marine Corps, I was a very good shot, and I did a lot of target shooting and a lot of stuff like that, and I've always -- I would like to get back into it, but I can't because I have a felony record; I can't own a firearm. So that was the reason why we were discussing this and one of the reasons why I showed him the gun in the first place.

I was scared of him, although I wasn't going to let him -- because I'm pretty macho, and I try to be pretty stoic about these things. Like I said, I almost called 9-1-1 on the guy. He was that obviously not kosher, for lack of a better word. That's why I showed him the weapon.

I had no desire to hurt anybody. I really didn't want to have the gun in the house in the first place, but I felt it was the only way to protect myself in view of the

incidents that had happened on the internet and people communicating things to me such as pictures of my home closeup on a website, on the internet, pictures of my license plate numbers, my driver's license picture on the internet on a website. How did it get there? Out of my computer. How did they get into my computer? I've got a great firewall. I have no idea.

This had been going on for about 10 months. The level of suspicion and paranoia gets to be a little bit unsettling sometimes with this. You add in the amount of drugs -- and I don't like to make an excuse like that, but I was double dosing the pain pills, I really was, because I was in a lot of pain, and I had to move around by myself. I had no choice.

I made a mistake. I should not have brought the gun into my house. I know that. I have no excuses for this. There are reasons I did things. At the time they seemed legitimate. Hindsight's always 20/20. If I had my choice, I would have asked a state trooper or a highway patrol -- or a county sheriff to park in my front yard rather than do that again. At the time -- people say, you know, you're making excuses. I'm not making excuses. I felt I had no other choice. Otherwise, I would have never done it.

We move forward to when I'm arrested and this

```
obstruction.
                  The FBI interviewed me for five hours in
 1
 2
    Charlotte and discussed a lot of things with me.
 3
              THE COURT: Mr. Welter?
              THE DEFENDANT:
 4
                              Yes.
              THE COURT: This is not the time to testify about
 5
 6
    things I've already ruled --
 7
              THE DEFENDANT: I know, Your Honor.
 8
              THE COURT: -- upon.
 9
              THE DEFENDANT:
                              Okay.
10
              THE COURT:
                         So if you've got anything that I need
    to consider in terms of your sentencing --
11
12
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
                                                 The FBI has had
    three interviews with me. At every interview, I have been
13
    as forthcoming and as honest and informative as I possible
14
15
    can. I've held nothing back from them. That's the first
16
    thing.
17
              The second thing is, as Ms. Costner -- as she put
18
    forward, when I got out of prison in 1995, six days after I
    got out of prison, I had a job. Six weeks after I got out
19
2.0
    of prison, I had my own apartment. Six months later, I was
    master certified before other certified technicians on top
21
22
    of it in the automotive field. And about eight years after
23
    I was out, I owned my home, my cars, and everything else.
    was driven to do this. I took myself from $130 in my pocket
24
25
    to success, and I did it by being very hard charging, very
```

focused on what I was doing, and staying out of trouble. 1 2 I don't use drugs. I never have. I don't drink. 3 I don't stay around people who can get me in trouble. I try to avoid that like the plague, which is why I accepted -- or 4 started getting into Islam -- into the religion of Islam. 5 6 Curiosity led me to research it. I found out it reflected 7 my theological beliefs, which is why I accepted it. But one 8 of the things you do when you accept religion is you have to 9 know everything that's going on about it. There's a lot of study, a lot of internet time, maybe even going to a country 10 across the water to find out what the people are actually 11 12 like and what the culture actually says and does, and this 13 is why I went to Lebanon, not to --THE COURT: You're not being sentenced here today 14 15 for any religious beliefs --THE DEFENDANT: 16 I know. That is a precursor --17 THE COURT: -- nor travel. 18 THE DEFENDANT: -- to what I'm going to say. Му intention has never been to hurt anybody or to follow what 19 20 people would call radical Islam. That's what I was getting 21 to. 22 Concerning the child pornography, I pled -- as I have communicated before, when Mr. Chamberlin first told me 23 about these things, I suspected there was possibly -- it 24 25 could possibly have been there because of my activities

US v. Welter - Sentence - May 30, 2013

online and people bringing things in. You tag it, link it in a chat room, and you go someplace, and you don't know what's there. I thought there might have been a possible link. I never saw any of this material, not that I can remember.

2.0

Be that as it may, it exists. Whether I like it or not, whether I want it or not -- and I don't want it. The stuff is pure poison. It destroys everything it touches. Whether that actually is there is the factor. And when I saw the original what they call discovery, they said there was five files, only five, and Mr. Chamberlin said this basically says you're guilty. I said, yeah, if it's on the computers, I'm guilty. I don't remember it, I cannot rectify it, but I'm guilty because of that. That is the reason why I pled guilty.

But when I thought about it, I knew that there had to be something more, and I kept demanding evidence; and when I saw the evidence, then I could say, at least with a clear conscious to myself, that there were other considerations as to how it got on there. People want me to say I went here, I went there, did this and did that, to get this stuff on my computer. The files say opposite and different from that. I say different from that.

It doesn't matter. At this juncture, it just doesn't matter anymore. I take responsibility for what's on

```
these hard drives because they were in my possession.
 1
 2
    supposed to know what's on them.
 3
              THE COURT: Did you knowingly possess child
 4
    pornography?
 5
              THE DEFENDANT:
                              Sir?
 6
              THE COURT: Did you knowingly possess child
 7
    pornography?
 8
              THE DEFENDANT: I possessed the hard drives.
                                                             The
 9
    child pornography was on it.
10
              THE COURT: Did you knowingly possess child
11
    pornography, yes or no?
12
              THE DEFENDANT: I never saw these images. They're
    there --
13
              THE COURT: Anything further, Mr. Welter?
14
15
              THE DEFENDANT:
                              They're there, and that's all I
16
    can say, Your Honor. I have to be honest. If I had seen
17
    them, I'd say, yeah, I saw them, and I didn't, and I just
18
    blew it off. I never saw them. And that's the file I
19
    showed to you. I'm sorry I can't be more thorough than
2.0
    that.
21
              THE COURT:
                         Were you being honest --
22
              THE DEFENDANT: Absolutely honest, Your Honor.
23
                          Listen to my question. Were you being
              THE COURT:
    honest with Judge Schroeder at your Rule 11 quilty plea?
24
25
              THE DEFENDANT: Given the level of information I
```

US v. Welter - Sentence - May 30, 2013

```
had --
 1
 2
                           No, sir. Were you being honest --
              THE COURT:
 3
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, I was as honest as I
    could be.
 4
                           All right. Anything further?
 5
              THE COURT:
 6
              THE DEFENDANT:
                              No, Your Honor.
                                                Thank you very
 7
    much.
              THE COURT:
                           We'll stand in recess for 10 minutes.
 8
               (At 11:05 a.m., break taken.)
 9
10
               (At 11:17 a.m., break concluded.)
                             All right.
                                         Mr. Green, did you want
11
              THE COURT:
12
    to be heard any further on my comments about the computer
13
    and the images?
                           No, sir.
14
              MR. GREEN:
15
              THE COURT:
                           All right.
                                       Well, in Mr. Welter's
16
    case, there are certainly some difficulties presented in
    terms of determining a sentence that is sufficient but not
17
18
    greater than necessary. Obviously, there is one offense,
    the 12CR123 offense, I think, if I've got my case numbers
19
20
    correct, possession of a firearm by a convicted felon, that
21
    is a relatively straightforward case for the most part.
22
              As I noted earlier in my comments to Ms. Costner
    during the -- we had the benefit of a full presentence
23
    report having been prepared at that particular point in
24
25
    time, and because of the operation of the guideline
```

US v. Welter - Sentence - May 30, 2013

calculation as well as the application of acceptance of responsibility, Mr. Welter ended up at a Level 12 and, roughly speaking, under the old guideline calculation, a 10-to 16-month guideline range. I think it would have been a twelve and a three -- let's see, a ten and three -- 10 to 16 months. With the removal of the point for -- the criminal history point, that would have dropped Mr. Welter to, I think, a ten and a two or an eight to fourteen months as the guideline -- applicable guideline range in that case.

2.0

After hearing Mr. Welter's testimony as well as his allocution to the Court and looking at his pattern of conduct in terms of minimizing his own conduct, quite frankly, I find it very difficult to believe any of what Mr. Welter offers as mitigating circumstances in terms of his possession of the firearm charge in this case and would otherwise as to that offense, after hearing Mr. Welter and his minimization, I would be inclined to impose a sentence which would reflect essentially a slight variance as to that offense, and that is an 18-month sentence as to the 12CR123 case.

I know I'm going about this a little differently because the guideline range is 108 to 135 months, but in terms of explaining the sentence that I am imposing here, I think it's a little easier for me to look at these two offenses and the 3553(a) factors in terms of the two

separate offenses, at least at the start.

2.0

The child pornography case presents a very different circumstance; that is, Mr. Welter has continued throughout the course of that case, at least following his plea of guilty and disclosure of the presentence report, offered varying statements to the Court in terms of his conduct in that case. After originally under oath admitting the elements of the offense and in essence accepting responsibility for the offense, Mr. Welter has offered a "I don't really think I did that" and not at all persuasive comments about things he does not recall about those hard drives, all of which are significantly undermined both by his original plea as well as his efforts to destroy -- have the hard drives destroyed.

Quite frankly, if there wasn't anything incriminating on the hard drives, why the urgency in having a neighbor go over into the workroom and destroy the hard drives? I find from the evidence before the Court that Mr. Welter did, in fact, know what was on those hard drives when he sent that letter, at least it appears to this Court that he did by the fact, A, it doesn't appear there was anything else incriminating on those hard drives, and, B, he sought to have those hard drives destroyed.

So in looking at the guideline calculation as is set forth in the amended presentence report, the child

pornography offense after application of the obstruction of justice and denial of acceptance of responsibility results in a base offense level of thirty, a criminal history category of two. And, ultimately, the firearm offense results in no upward adjustment. So the thirty and a two, at least as I read the presentence report, all flows from the child pornography offense.

2.0

matter of fact, it almost occurs all the time now for a plus two to be -- occur for use of a computer. I have, as I've expressed many times, very mixed feelings about a computer. It certainly in terms of interstate commerce has a significant effect on state commerce and availability through file sharing to these types of materials. On the other hand, it makes this material significantly easier to access in this day and time, and I'm not convinced in every case, including Mr. Welter's, that the two-level increase corresponds to -- I guess what you would say the implied increase in culpability in the commission of the offense.

So a thirty and a two, if I remove the two levels for use of a computer, we'd end up at a twenty-eight and a two, that is 87 to 108 months. In this case it seems to me that the number of images is not significantly alarming to suggest further dangerousness to the public in terms of any pedophilia or child victim or abuse offenses. But on the

other hand, Mr. Welter's conduct of committing offenses and then minimizing those offenses does cause the Court significant concern.

2.0

So I am finding that a sentence of 70 months for Count One -- or for 12CR399 is sufficient but not greater than necessary looking at the guideline range as well as the number of images. I recognize that that -- the total sentence I will impose, that is, a sentence of 88 months is a 20-month variance from the low end of the guideline range. But in terms of Mr. Welter's conduct in looking at the -- I'll explain it further in just a second, but looking at the total conduct in these two separate offenses, I find that a sentence -- that sentence, that is, 88 months, is sufficient but not greater than necessary.

The two -- looking specifically at the 3553 factors as those factors relate to the two offenses of conviction, both the possession of a firearm under the circumstances of this case, that is, Mr. Welter's past criminal history as well as his demonstration of the firearm to the undercover officer, the presence of other ammunition, and Mr. Welter's express interest in purchasing other firearms make this, in the Court's mind, a very serious offense.

As I have indicated, the child -- the seriousness of the child pornography offense, even looking at it in

tandem with the commission of another offense, does not strike the Court as the most serious of the child pornography offenses, but I say that fully recognizing, as Mr. Green has argued, that the materials themselves as well as the continued damage to the victims of that crime, that is, the individuals who are filmed in -- or photographed in those child pornography cases just simply cannot be overstated in terms of the seriousness of the offense.

Mr. Welter has a very unusual history. He has a substantial history of military service, even though it ended in less than honorable circumstances; and in spite of whatever disadvantages Mr. Welter may have faced by the serious felony conviction earlier, he has managed to maintain a very good employment history.

I do find in light of all those factors that a sentence -- that a total sentence in this case of 88 months followed by, as to the 399 case, a period of 15 years of supervised release is sufficient but not greater than necessary to -- on the terms and conditions set forth in the presentence report.

I find -- Mr. Welter, you're going to have to change the way you do things. You may be smarter than this Court, you may be smarter than some of the people you are around, but you will not be smarter than the collective wisdom of the probation officer during the period of

supervised release, and you are simply going to have to be straight up, candid, and honest with the probation office during the period of supervised release.

I recognize that that sentence constitutes a variance from the guideline range, but in Mr. Welter's case, as I have indicated, both the types of images as well as the use of the computer, at least in the Court's opinion, sometimes overstate the seriousness of a -- I hesitate to say "simple," but an offense that involves solely the possession of child pornography materials.

So that's the sentence that I intend to impose.

Ms. Costner, do you wish to be heard further on that
sentence?

MS. COSTNER: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Green, I recognize that's different from what you urged on the Court. I'll hear from you further if you wish to be heard.

MR. GREEN: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Welter, if you will stand, please, sir.

In Count One, Case No. 12CR123, it is hereby ordered that the defendant is committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons for a term of 18 months followed by three years of supervised release. A special assessment of \$100 is mandatory, is hereby imposed, and is due and payable

immediately. A fine is waived because of the defendant's inability to pay, and restitution is not imposed as to count -- as to the count in this case.

2.0

As to Count One of Case No. 12CR399, the defendant is hereby committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons for a term of 70 months. That sentence is imposed to run consecutively to the sentence imposed in Case No. 12CR123 followed by 15 years of supervised release, which shall run concurrently with the supervised release imposed as to 12CR123. A special assessment of \$100 is mandatory and is hereby imposed in this case for a total of \$200. Those special assessments are due and payable immediately.

The Court does recommend to the Bureau of Prisons that the defendant be designated to a facility where he may receive a psychological evaluation and any recommended treatment while in the custody of the Bureau of Prisons, and, furthermore, that he be designated to a facility where he may receive such medical treatment as deemed reasonably necessary by the Bureau of Prisons.

During the period of supervised release, it is ordered that the defendant shall comply with the standard terms and conditions of supervised release. In addition to the standard terms and conditions, the following special conditions are imposed:

One, the defendant shall cooperatively participate

in an evaluation and a mental health treatment program with emphasis on sex offender treatment and pay for any treatment services as directed by the probation officer. Treatment may include any physiological testing such as the polygraph and penile plethysmograph and the use of any prescribed medications.

Two, the defendant shall not use or possess a computer to access any online computer service at any location, including employment, without the prior approval of the probation officer. This includes any internet service provider, bulletin board system, or any other public or private computer network. And it seems to me,

Ms. Costner and Mr. Green, I don't intend this provision to cover a standalone, not online, diagnostic computer that may be used solely for purposes of automotive employment if I'm making myself clear.

MR. GREEN: Yes, sir.

2.0

THE COURT: This provision is not inclined -imposed to include an automotive diagnostic computer that is
not online and is available solely for the purpose of
conducting automotive computer diagnostics.

Three, if granted access to an online computer service, the defendant shall consent to the probation officer conducting periodic, unannounced examinations of his computer equipment which may include, hardware, software,

and copying all data from his computers. This may also include the removal of such equipment when necessary for the purpose of conducting a more thorough examination.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Four, the defendant shall consent to third-party disclosure to any employer or potential employer concerning any computer-related restrictions that have been imposed upon him.

Five, the defendant shall provide personal, business, telephone records to the probation officer upon request and consent to the release of certain information from any online, telephone, or similar account.

Six, the defendant shall not have any contact other than incidental contact in a public forum such as ordering in a restaurant, grocery shopping, etc., with any person under the age of 18 except for his own children without prior permission of the probation office. approved contact shall be supervised by an adult at all times. The contact addressed in this condition includes, but is not limited to, direct or indirect, personal, telephonic, written, or through a third party. If the defendant has any contact with any child, that is, a person under the age of 18 years not otherwise addressed in this condition, the defendant is required to immediately remove himself from the situation and notify the probation officer within 24 hours.

US v. Welter - Sentence - May 30, 2013

Seven, the defendant shall not frequent places where children congregate, that is, parks, playgrounds, schools, video arcades, day care centers, swimming pools, or other places primarily used by children under the age of 18 without the prior approval of the probation officer.

Six [sic], the defendant shall not view, purchase, possess, or control any sexually explicit materials including, but not limited to, pictures, magazines, videotapes, movies, or any other material obtained through access to any computer or any material linked to computer access or use. I think I said six. I think I'm on nine.

The defendant shall submit to a search of his person, property, house, residence, vehicle, papers, computer, or other electronic communication or data storage devices or media and effects at any time without a warrant by any law enforcement officer or probation officer with reasonable suspicion concerning unlawful conduct or a violation of a condition of probation or supervised release.

And, ten, the defendant shall register with the state sex offender registration agency in each jurisdiction where he resides, is employed, carries on a vocation, or is a student. The defendant will be required to keep his registration current. For initial registration only, the defendant must also register in the jurisdiction where he was convicted if he does not reside in that jurisdiction.

```
Mr. Welter, you do have the right to appeal the
 1
 2
    sentence that I have imposed in this case. If you choose to
 3
    appeal, notice of appeal must be filed within 14 days of
    entry of judgment. If you wish to appeal and cannot afford
 4
    the services of counsel, counsel will be appointed to
 5
 6
    represent you. Ms. Costner will be responsible for advising
 7
    you with respect to your right to appeal and filing a notice
 8
    of appeal if you instruct her to do so.
 9
              Ms. Costner, anything further?
10
              MS. COSTNER: No, Your Honor.
              THE COURT: Mr. Green?
11
12
              MR. GREEN: A destruction order for the hard
    drives at the expiration of the period of appeal and an
13
    order for return of the firearm to its lawful owner; and if
14
15
    that person cannot lawful possess one, then it be destroyed.
              THE COURT: All right.
                                       I will order the
16
17
    destruction of any computer hard drive seized at the
18
    conclusion of any appeals period, and I'll order the return
19
    of the firearm to a lawful, rightful owner if one can be
2.0
    located upon reasonable efforts, and, if not, the firearm
21
    destroyed according to law at the conclusion of any appeals
22
    period.
23
              All right. Good luck to you, Mr. Welter.
                    (At 11:36 a.m., proceedings concluded.)
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE I, JOSEPH B. ARMSTRONG, RMR, FCRR, United States District Court Reporter for the Middle District of North Carolina, DO HEREBY CERTIFY: That the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the proceedings had in the within-entitled action; that I reported the same in stenotype to the best of my ability; and thereafter reduced same to typewriting through the use of Computer-Aided Transcription. Joseph B. Armstrong RMR, FC United States Court Reporter Date: 09/30/13 RMR, FCRR 324 W. Market Street Greensboro, NC

US v. Welter - Sentence - May 30, 2013